

Application No. 09/03,958
Amendment "A" dated March 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed September 22, 2005

REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action made final and dated September 22, 2005. A petition and fee for a three-month extension of time accompany this response along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). The Office Action rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States patent number 6,324,405 issued to Young et al. (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Young"). Of these claims, Claims 1 and 6-10 are independent. By this amendment, Claims 1, 6, 7 and 9 are amended and remain in independent form.

In support of the rejection, the Examiner offers the reasoning provided in Sections 3 through 9 of the Office Action, which is similar to the reasoning provided in Sections 1 through 7 of the prior Office Action dated March 25, 2005. After presenting some areas in which the Applicants' respectfully traverse this reasoning, the Applicants will then present some reasoning to address section 10 of the Office Action entitled "Response to Arguments" in which the Office Action addressed similar reasoning provided in our Amendment "B".

For example, Section 4 of the Office Actions states that "a subscriber information management apparatus that manages subscriber information of the invention is equivalent to "SIM 35 and SIM memory 35b" of Young (see lines 2 through 4 of Section 4). However, it is clear from Figures 2, 11, 17 and 21 of Young that SIM 35 and SIM memory 35b are not a "subscriber information management apparatus that manages subscriber information" but instead are simply memories that are loaded to the handset 2. In addition, the applicants continue to traverse the rejection under the same reasoning as provided in response to the prior Office Action. Accordingly, all previous arguments made in Amendment "B" are incorporated herein.

2, Re: Sections 10

Application No. 09/903,558
Amendment "C" dated March 21, 2006.
Reply to Office Action mailed September 22, 2005

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action, the Office Action contends that Figure 21 of Young disclose that "smart card" reader 33 receives second smart card (SIM) 35 storing second user information.

However, referring to col. 17 lines 35-67 of Young, user terminals can be loaded a SIM card and a credit card (magnetic stripe card), and be used primarily for outgoing calls in the manner of a payphone. Accordingly, from this teaching of Young, one of ordinary skill in the art would not infer that the credit card stores subscriber identity to be sent to said subscriber information management apparatus.

Furthermore, the Office Action states that col. 2 lines 3-12, col. 12 lines 12-25 and col. 16 lines 13-25 of Young discloses "transmitting means for transmitting, when said detecting means detects at least two recording media, first subscriber identity information corresponding to a first recording medium along with second subscriber identity information corresponding to a newly detected recording medium to said subscriber information management apparatus" as recited in many of the amended claims.

However, the description of col. 2 lines 3-12 of Young describes only HLR and VLR of GSM. The description of col. 12 lines 12-25 of Young describes only that date stored in database station 15 (such as HLR) is used when call between one mobile user and another is setup. The description of col. 16 lines 13-25 of Young describes only that subscriber identity in SIM 35 is stored in a store 330 of mobile platform.

Further, the Office Action states that col. 9 lines 9-18 and col. 10 lines 24-32 of Young discloses "receiving means for receiving said first subscriber identity information along with said second subscriber identity information from said mobile terminal" as recited in many of the claims.

Application No. 09/901,958
Amendment "C" dated March 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed September 22, 2005

However, the description of col. 9 lines 9 -18 of Young describes only that store 54 (such as HLR) indicates status of each subscriber terminal apparatus 2. The description of col. 10 lines 24 -32 of Young describes only that the status of each apparatus 2 (i.e. "local" or "global") is stored in the stores 54.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn, and withdrawal is respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 21st day of March, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds
135000003206V001